

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

In re T.S. et al., Persons Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

FRESNO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

B.S.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F072850

(Super. Ct. Nos. 13CEJ300195-1,
13CEJ300195-3)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Fresno County. Mary Dolas,
Judge.

Roni Keller, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Levy, Acting P.J., Gomes, J. and Franson, J.

B.S. (mother) appealed from the juvenile court's order terminating her parental rights (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26)¹ as to her now seven-year-old son T.S. and three-year-old daughter A.H. After reviewing the juvenile court record, mother's court-appointed counsel informed this court she could find no arguable issues to raise on mother's behalf. This court granted mother leave to personally file a letter setting forth a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error exists. (*In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, 844 (*Phoenix H.*))

Mother submitted a letter in which she asserts that she was misdiagnosed with bipolar disorder and that the medication she was prescribed contributed to her instability. She states that she has been off of the medication for over a year and has maintained her sobriety. She further states that she has a two-bedroom apartment and believes that she deserves to have her children back. She seeks to have her parental rights reinstated.

We conclude mother failed to address the termination findings or orders or set forth a good cause showing that any arguable issue of reversible error arose from the section 366.26 hearing. (*Phoenix H., supra*, 47 Cal.4th at p. 844.) Consequently, we dismiss the appeal.

PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL SUMMARY

In July 2013, then four-year-old T.S and one-month-old A.H. were taken into protective custody along with their two-year-old sister A.K. by the Fresno County Department of Social Services (department) after police responded to a disturbance at a motel room and arrested mother and her boyfriend, Aaron H., for domestic violence. Mother was intoxicated and the police found beer cans and beer bottles in her motel room. Mother said she had bipolar disorder but was not taking her medication. The department placed the children together in foster care.

¹ All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

In October 2013, the juvenile court exercised its dependency jurisdiction over the children and ordered mother and Aaron, A.H.'s father, to participate in reunification services. The court denied services for T.S.'s father and ordered A.K.'s father to participate in family maintenance services.

In April 2014, at the six-month review hearing, the juvenile court granted A.K.'s father sole physical custody of her and terminated its dependency jurisdiction as to her. The court terminated Aaron's reunification services and continued mother's reunification services to the 12-month review hearing in August 2014. At a contested 12-month review hearing in October 2014, the court continued mother's reunification services for an additional three months.

In its report for the 18-month review hearing, the department recommended the juvenile court terminate mother's reunification services because she failed to follow through with any of her services. The department reported that mother's behavior had become increasingly erratic and she had not demonstrated the ability to manage her psychotropic medication or remain free of drugs.

In March 2015, following a contested 18-month review hearing, the juvenile court terminated mother's reunification services and set a section 366.26 hearing. Mother did not challenge the court's setting hearing by extraordinary writ petition.

Prior to the section 366.26 hearing, mother filed a section 388 petition asking the juvenile court to reinstate reunification services. She stated she was clean and sober, had a sponsor, was seeking housing, and looking for employment. The juvenile court denied her petition.

In November 2015, the juvenile court conducted a contested 366.26 hearing. The department's recommendation was to terminate parental rights and order adoption as the permanent plan for T.S. and A.H. In its report for the hearing, the department informed the court that mother was unable to care for the children and had not visited them since

November 2014. In addition, her visitation remained supervised because she did not take her medication, which rendered her unstable.

Mother testified at the contested 366.26 hearing. At the conclusion of the hearing, the juvenile court found that the children were likely to be adopted. The court also considered whether the exception to adoption contained in section 366.26, subdivision (c)(1)(B)(i) (“the beneficial relationship exception”) applied in mother’s case. The beneficial relationship exception applies when: “The parents have maintained regular visitation and contact with the child and the child would benefit from continuing the relationship.” (§ 366.26, subd. (c)(1)(B)(i).) The court concluded the exception did not apply to mother, terminated her parental rights as to T.S. and A.H., and ordered the children placed for adoption.

DISCUSSION

An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) It is appellant’s burden to raise claims of reversible error or other defect and present argument and authority on each point made. If appellant fails to do so, the appeal may be dismissed. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.)

At a termination hearing, the juvenile court’s focus is on whether it is likely the child will be adopted and if so, order termination of parental rights. (*In re Marilyn H.* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 295, 309.) If, as in this case, the child is likely to be adopted, the juvenile court must terminate parental rights unless the parent proves there is a compelling reason for finding that termination would be detrimental to the child under any of the circumstances listed in section 366.26, subdivision (c)(1)(B). The party seeking to establish the existence of one of the section 366.26, subdivision (c)(1)(B) exceptions has the burden of producing that evidence. (*In re Megan S.* (2002) 104 Cal.App.4th 247, 252.)

Though we are not required to, we have reviewed the record as it relates to the juvenile court's findings and orders from the section 366.26 hearing, and we have found no arguable issues for briefing. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal.

DISPOSITION

This appeal is dismissed.